UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Earth Could Be Fair - - - *J. Ray Shute*

A Proposition to Leaders of Humanism - - - - - - - - - *Edith Hansen*

The Ebb Tide of Liberty - - - - - - - - - - - *William P. Jenkins*

Speaking of Man—and Nature - - - - - - - - - - *Victor S. Yarros*

The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness - - *Robert M. Bowman*

Western Conference News

Volume CXXXIX NUMBER 2

Chicago, May-June, 1953

PRICE TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Bimonthly *Except During July-August*

Subscription $1.50 *Single Copies 25 cents*

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter October 7, 1952, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879."

CURTIS W. REESE, *Editor*

CONTRIBUTORS

Robert M. Bowman: Minister of the Universalist Church, Waterloo, Iowa.

Sylvanus M. Duvall: Professor in George Williams College, Chicago.

Edith Hansen: Homemaker.

William P. Jenkins: Minister of the First Unitarian Congregation of Toronto.

J. Ray Shute: Editorial writer, *The Christian Register.*

Victor S. Yarros: Attorney and journalist.

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL—CURTIS W. REESE 19

ARTICLES—

Earth Could Be Fair—J. RAY SHUTE 20

A Proposition to Leaders of Humanism—EDITH HANSEN 23

The Ebb Tide of Liberty—WILLIAM P. JENKINS 24

Speaking of Man—and Nature—VICTOR S. YARROS 26

The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness—ROBERT M. BOWMAN 27

STUDY TABLE—

Book Notes—SYLVANUS M. DUVALL 30

Unitarian Literary Figure—CURTIS W. REESE 30

Appraisal Question—RANDALL S. HILTON 30

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS 31

THE FIELD—

Probing Political Opinions—*ACLU Bulletin* 18

THE FIELD

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion"

Probing Political Opinions

The American Civil Liberties Union has cautioned the House Un-American Activities Committee not to investigate mere political beliefs and associations, while acknowledging the Committee's right to probe Communist Party activities.

The ACLU statement was occasioned by the House Committee's hearings in New York City into Communism in the entertainment industry and education.

In a letter to Rep. Harold F. Velde, (R.Ill.), chairman of the House Committee, executive director Patrick Murphy Malin said the opposition of the ACLU was based on its belief that the mandate of the Committee to investigate propaganda is an abridgement of the constitutional right of free speech and association.

"Investigation of alleged illegal acts, or other matters over which Congress has constitutional power is one thing; an inquiry directed solely at political opinions and associations, which are lawful and over which in themselves Congress has no power—however abhorrent they are to you and to us—is quite another thing."

Asserting that the House Committee's inquiries into Communist Party membership or association "may in some measure be properly related to purposes which are constitutionally permitted to Congress," the ACLU spokesman added:

"However, the proper extent of such inquiries has not yet been fully clarified by our courts. The U.S. Supreme Court has not yet determined the limits of congressional inquiry required by the First Amendment. Within the bounds set by lower court decisions, we believe that your Committee's inquiries should be even more strictly limited. For most of all, we believe that Congressional committees should, by self-denying ordinances, preserve the principle of free association by exercising that wisdom which is a vitally necessary supplement to the legal guaranties in maintaining the spirit of our free society."

(*Continued on page* 30)

UNITY

VOLUME CXXXIX MAY-JUNE, 1953 No. 2

EDITORIAL

President Eisenhower in his Dartmouth address sounded a much needed warning against book burners and censorship of literature in general. This word coming from the Republican President of the United States should give courage to the friends of liberty and give pause to the little Hitlers who have sprung up in America. America was founded on freedom of speech, press, and assembly. And violation of these principles is un-American. Incalculable damage is being done to the mind of America by the spirit and the tactics of the Velde, the Jenner, and the McCarthy committees of Congress. Sooner or later—and better sooner than later—the Republican leadership, including especially the President and Senator Taft, must specifically call a halt to the small and fearful minds that are undoubtedly embarrassing the Administration and jeopardizing the Republican chances of victory in 1954 and 1956. America has enjoyed freedom too long to be whipped into a permanent lather by the rantings and careless utterances of the Senator from Wisconsin. The great mass of the people of America cherish liberty, and when they know what the issues are and what the dangers are there will be no doubt of their reaction. They will speedily call the little Hitlers to the bar of public opinion and condemn them to political oblivion. The great virtues of America—freedom, tolerance, and generous attitudes—are permanently built into the conscience of America, and they cannot be defeated by fear. All reasonable Americans want America protected from subversives. But they want the job done under clearly defined laws that are in accord with the Constitution; and by public officials duly charged with the duty, and not by irresponsible and incompetent committees of Congress that drag great names like that of Bishop Oxnam through the mire. Now that President Eisenhower has spoken the basic word, let him follow through and he will find America well-nigh unanimous in supporting him. There has been enough dillydallying with this problem. Let the President and his able associates now act firmly and speedily to protect the liberties of us all.

Curtis W. Reese.

Earth Could Be Fair

J. RAY SHUTE

Most people are fatalists; they take life as they find it and make little, if any, effort to develop themselves or the society of which they are a part. If they are born into a community of people who hold certain religious, political, economic or social views, then those beliefs are usually incorporated into their lives without question and the easy road of conformity is followed. Occasionally, however, there will emerge in such a community a brave, inquiring soul who will question the *status quo;* who will say: "How do I *know* that all of these things are really true?" It was this spirit of inquiry that first led to experimentation, to discovery, to invention, and to change. Without this spirit man today would still be living in caves, without language, means of transportation, or the means of conquering nature. This spirit of doubt, of inquiry, has been largely responsible for the distinction between man and other forms of animal life.

The mid-twentieth century saw in the West a loss of nerve; men who had previously possessed the virtue of doubt and who were willing to experiment suddenly became afraid. A rigidity of conformity arose, reminiscent of the Middle Ages, and man was asked to moor his intellectual bark and desist from further explorations. A neo-orthodoxy made its appearance in religion, politics, and other areas of human life. There arose the specter of witch-hunting for non-conformists to the *status quo*. Within this climate we today pause to take stock. We find ourselves reëvaluating our historical position, the means whereby man reached his present state, the hopes we might see for the future, and the lessons we should have learned from our past experiences. At first blush we realize that there are basic reasons why the loss of nerve occurred. We feel reasonably sure that the current headlong flight from reason and progress has been spearheaded by those who control and manipulate what had heretofore been historic centers of authority: the state, the church, social and educational institutions. With the coming of the Atomic Age the very foundations of those bastions of the *status quo* have been stricken and the institutional structures are in danger of total collapse. In such a day when research and additional inquiry are indicated on a much larger and more extensive scale, the leaders of infallibility become prophets of doom and frantically cry out against further advance, saying: "Thus far, but no farther." In short, we are being told that the tested techniques which we have used to advance to the very frontiers of the golden age are invalid and we must now, after centuries of battling to the outposts, retreat without even viewing the outskirts of the city toward which we have so long been advancing. Many of us are reluctant to follow such advice. The habit of questioning authority has long been an unpopular pastime and the non-conformists have always been a ready prey of the frightened rulers. It is no different today. But the encouraging thought is that change always does occur when the people have courage and, notwithstanding the fact that change is always resisted by the masses and is always unpopular, yet it is inevitable. Whether change is for the good or the bad is dependent wellnigh exclusively on the value judgments established. I believe it was Kipling who said, "when we are through changing, we're through."

Modern man has learned one basic fact, among many other valuable things: there are no ultimate values, no absolutes. There is *only* change. Consequently, *all* concepts and values have validity only during their term of office. Upon the value of these concepts and institutions depends solely their chance of reëlection—their continuation of acceptability. Whenever they cease to have value, they will be discarded. It is this pregnant fact that will eventually spell out the durability of all institutions, and this, then, is the crust of fear surrounding the cult of doom that currently advocates retreat from reality and progress. It is a modern version of the ancient story of Canute demanding the sea to stay in its womb and spew not itself upon the beach.

Having given validity to the theory of tentativeness, modern man now is in the process of hammering out on the anvil of experience his new set of values and his temporary goals to guide him in the immediate future. He knows little beyond the nature and location of his problems, but he at least knows where he is and what his immediate problems are. He has an orientation point within time. This is more than his opponents have. His most valuable assets are his experience and courage. The first cannot be taken from him and the latter is his hope, as well as the most vulnerable spot in his armor. It is the latter against which the enemy is now directing his attack. Time alone will spell out the verdict.

To many the Statue of Liberty has become a symbol of the foolish virgin with a loaded pistol—a gun moll. To others she is still a symbol of hope to the millions of downtrodden throughout the world, even if the torch she holds high burns with a somewhat feeble ray. Today, she must be a lonely gal as she stands midst the tears washing Bedloe's Island. The McCarran Act came perilously near extinguishing her torch. All hope is not lost, however, and we may one day correct this tragic error. It is a part of the current program of retreat and fear. It is symptomatic of the reactionary frustration with which certain elements of our people are presently beset. We shall no doubt have to live with this segment of our population and their neurotic impulses for some time yet. But, we trust, this group and its distorted view of history will, in time, lose its importance and the fear-stricken audience to which it now addresses its diatribes. Even the recent national election need not cause us too much despair, for there are many facets to the picture and it is always darkest before dawn. Excesses inevitably lead to moderation or, as a friend put it at Oxford last summer, "We can't make a dachshund into a Great Dane by overfeeding."

Out of unusual periods of time there emerge unusual people; out of misery usually comes hope; out of despair we can look for promise. Times of tension produce men of courage and out of the dark always come men with vision. We have few problems not created and subject to solution by man. Whatever confronts us we have the resources to solve; whatever ground we have lost can be regained; whatever the debt, we have the resources with which to pay. We need only have courage and faith—with these virtues man cannot lose his fight. There are two fundamental reasons why the world is not going to the dogs: first,

the dogs do not want it, and second, we do not propose to surrender it! Most of the fear in the world today is self-generated. It is generated by those who see their status impaired and are reluctant to adapt themselves to a changing world. It is, therefore, not unusual to witness opposition from quarters which have historically opposed all progressive movements. It was ever thus. There is, however, a certain aspect to the present situation which greatly differentiates it from previous encounters: the fight today is for the very existence of orthodoxy itself. It is anticipated that if the present struggle is lost by fundamentalism, then all is lost indeed. That premise, most assuredly, seems valid and constitutes the core of the problem.

The world faces a primary choice: in the Atomic Age shall man remain shackled to old forms of antiquated authority or shall he develop new and more practical disciplines within which to live, move and have his being? This is the crux of the matter: The dualism of the either-or choice must give way to the pluralism of synthesis. It will, naturally, not be resolved so simply and we are guilty of over-simplification; but the fact, we think, will stand. The success or failure of the present revolution throughout the world has no particular association with Communism, except as that ideology localizes itself in terms of either (a) Russian imperialism or (b) local reaction to existing local conditions. The more natural reaction of national groups to world conditions would be to democracy as a method, had not this system become so confused to the mass-mind and so identified with the reactionary elements of the Western world. There is little choice offered to those throughout the world today seeking individual and collective emancipation unless we elect to clarify the democratic pattern. In the first place, no national group has the military strength to resist Russia alone. In the second place, oppressed and backward groups cannot see in a capitalistic and reactionary fundamentalism any place for themselves to function with that freedom, respect, and participation which they crave. To be sure, there is no place for them in Communism either except as slaves, yet this fact somehow remains obscured. A man being swept to his doom by a flooded stream will grasp at a branch from the shore, even if that branch be poisonous. For, on the one hand, death by drowning appears imminent and, on the other, he may find a cure on dry land for poisoning. It is a choice between the positive and the possible, and the lesser of the two evils is accepted as the only choice available. Democracy can and should furnish a positive choice by preference. This is the challenge of the times and upon our decision the future of mankind may well depend.

Having said that the modern version of democracy is proving unacceptable to the masses seeking emancipation, we must also say, if we are honest, that it need not remain this way forever. American democracy has developed into what it is by virtue of our desire and demand that it be so. Capitalism is not evil *per se*. It is the distorted direction that we have permitted it to take that is unhealthy. We had the corrective machinery at hand to use if we had so desired, but we refused and big business resulted, with its impersonal, cold-blooded approach to all human problems. In turn it created—which may at first seem anomalous—big labor. Yet, this was as inevitable as was the development of big government. Labor committed its original sin by taking its lessons and, indeed, its direction from big business, and today suffers a hell for it. It is a certainty that government is in the same dire straits. The chains, combines, and mammoth institutions must surely give way to a system of economic pluralism wherein and whereby individual and private enterprise—as distinguished from free enterprise—the preservation of private property, the development of a more widespread cooperative movement, plus government ownership and operation of certain essential utilities must be preserved and so integrated and coordinated as to insure us a maximum production and efficiency at the lowest possible cost. In government we must also come to a redefined system of pluralism in which local, state, and national government—later, also, international government—will be integrated and tax duplications eliminated. The specific areas of responsibilities, services, and taxation must be defined so that there will be no duplications, overlapping, and divided loyalties. We must increase rather than decrease the social responsibilities of government at all levels and come to the realization once and for all time that man creates governments for his benefit and that they are to serve him rather than man serving government. The authority must always come from the people to government—never the opposite. Government must respond to the corrective will of the people and there should be a minimum amount of pressure exerted upon the people by government. The theory of inherent power, like that of divine right of kings, should be removed by law from government, its instrumentalities—including the Congress—its elected and appointed officials and all employees. What powers shall be possessed by government, its agencies and officials, should be only those granted in law by the people or by their duly elected representatives. Government by legal opinion must, likewise, be corrected so that the judiciary cannot thwart the will of the people speaking through the legislative or the executive branches of government. The checks and restraints must be preserved but within a more clarified framework. These things can and should be done. Above all, Congressional immunity must be restudied and, if necessary, abolished. Character assassination must be stopped, once and forever. None of the branches of government should invade the domain of other branches. Congress should be restrained from police activities, as well as from judicial activities—not to mention the invasion of the executive. The executive and the judicial must not invade the legislative branch. Finally, the unit system of voting should be discontinued, so that the majority can elect.

Our greatest reformation is needed sociologically—this, however, will come from the people themselves in time. Authority over the mind of man is fast dying; the yoke will not be borne much longer. Religion is in the process of reformation—time alone will correct the many errors so glaringly obvious. The passing of the supernatural is only a matter of time: man has outgrown his superstitions and fears which gave rise to this monstrous myth, which has kept him enslaved to religious authority. Infallibility is no longer accepted by enlightened people and the spread of education will, in time, do the final chore in the complete emancipation of man.

At the moment there is under way a titanic struggle within orthodox religion. On the surface this is not too apparent and the public generally is perhaps not too aware of what is going on. However, within the inner circles of most of the fundamentalist denominations there is strife: The neo-orthodox, contending man is a

worm—incapable of little other than praying for divine mercy in his sinful and helpless condition—and the liberals, who seek to ground religious faith on modern scientific truth—meaning, in the final analysis, the discarding of "revealed truth." We have arrived finally at the position of realizing that the man who can discard his reason and blindly follow another man or group of men who claim special insights and revelations of the unknown can just as easily discard his reason and follow a political dictator. The process is identical. We know that we live in a natural and explorable universe; we have learned and are learning a great deal about it. We know, religious myths to the contrary notwithstanding, that our world is not the center of the universe—as a matter of fact it is a rather insignificant speck in space. We know how it was created and how it changes; we know that it cannot be flooded and cannot be commanded to stand still. We know that it is not flat, with a heaven above and a hell below. We know that heaven and hell are non-existent physically. We can find no scientific evidence whatever for supernaturalism. Hence, our concepts of God have also undergone basic changes. We know that God is not an English-speaking, white superman riding on a cloud—our astronomers and aviators would long since have discovered him. Our ideas of God have long ago changed and when the term is used it refers to the spirit of life that animates all of creation; it is the relation of man to the universe. Hence, there is no intervention in the natural order: things will be exactly as we make them. The divine in man produces the good things in life. The evil produces evil. To attempt to personalize such a concept is to be at once both unscientific and absurd. We might just as well call love a beautiful female, consisting of mother, daughter, and holy spirit. To seek authority for conventional, mythological religion in a book, a creed, an institution or a man is to be guilty of idolatry. Uneducated masses seem to require this in religion, even as they seem to require someone to lead them in organizing their political, economic, and social life; but this leads to the very thing we today seem to be fighting: authoritarianism and slavery. Too many people, unfortunately, seem to think that authority over their minds in religion is nothing about which they should express alarm. But is this true? Just what is religion?

Religion is the organization of one's life around a set of values to which one is willing to make a total commitment. These values are what a person deems to be the greatest good of which he can conceive and worthy goals toward which he aspires and which he is willing to make central in his life. Therefore, to be religious implies believing in such a set of values, orienting one's life in terms of those values, and striving to attain them. The man, therefore, who is committed to, and strives for, wealth is a religious man, but his concept of life is so oriented that he has made money his god. Never let it be said that such a man is irreligious. He has established what to him is the ideal good and he is living his life in terms of this belief. The man who seeks power does likewise. The man who is an unbeliever, an atheist, is the man who finds in life no values worthy of striving for; nothing worth commitment to. So, as a rule, such a man has nothing to live for and usually he blows his brains out or jumps from a hotel window—life is useless.

The set of values to which a man makes his commitment and which represents the highest, noblest, and best good of which he is capable of conceiving can quite fittingly be designated by the English language symbol "God." In such an interpretation of life there is no anthropomorphic concept which would be appropriate. We certainly would not attempt to develop form, even supernatural form, to a set of values. We could, likewise, hardly localize these values into a static geography of location. Perhaps we could say that the attainment of these goals would be heaven; the repudiation or loss, hell. In this sense we might use the term, "salvation by character."

As may readily be noted from our construction of a modern faith to live by, the orthodox relation of man to God—i.e., King to subject, slave to master—is rendered obsolete, as indeed it must be. A religion, to make sense, must give to the practitioner more than a perverted satisfaction of serving a king or master, who is both feared and adored and to whom lavish petitions and prayers are constantly directed in the hope that in some miraculous way his attention may be drawn to the unworthy and grovelling slave. This type of symbolism in the Bible was, of course, true to world conditions at the time when those writings were fabricated. Certainly no intelligent man living in the Atomic Age would accept such a condition for living. And it is this distorted view of history—this antiquated concept of life—that is so frustrating in the scientific age in which we are now living. Man cannot live in two worlds at one and the same time, try though he may. It is this anomaly that keeps us mixed up as we try to meet at the conference table with Eastern and other people who, likewise, have their own view of history. We have placed an onus of contempt upon those who take the scientific view of life as opposed to the supernatural. We call them materialists—and hence Communists. But Communists, while they are materialists, are just as orthodox as the fundamental religionists—and just as unscientific. They believe in the infallibility of the state and thus establish a rigidity of conformity thereto. The Communist differs from the orthodox Christian primarily in his use of symbols. Both would deny the individual the freedom to which he is entitled. Both are undemocratic. It is but natural that these forces so bitterly oppose each other, because they are ideological rivals. Modern man wants no system of authority—he wants freedom and democracy. More than that, he wants respect and dignity as he meets the problems of life and works out his techniques and methodologies for their solution. Hence, he does not want his government permitting the dissemination of these mythologies to his children in public schools; he does not want his government subscribing to these errors and making them cornerstones to its diplomatic policies. Above all, modern enlightened man wants democracy and education to grow and develop so that the masses may be emancipated from ancient superstitions and uncouth prejudices which breed intolerance, fear, and war. War is part and parcel of the ancient tradition. We have outgrown it in principle, the next step is to outlaw it in practice. "Earth could be fair and all her people one."

In order that the human race may survive on this planet, it is necessary that there should be enough people in enough places in the world who do not have to fight each other, who are not the kinds of people who will fight each other, and who are the kinds of people who will take effective measures whenever it is necessary to prevent other people's fighting."

—G. B. Chisholm.

A Proposition to Leaders of Humanism

EDITH HANSEN

"Do you think that I should take Jonnie to a psychiatrist?" My friend explained that Jonnie seemed normal, but a neighbor had suggested that, inasmuch as she took Jonnie regularly to a dentist and to a medical doctor, she should take him regularly also to a psychiatrist. My friend could take her young son to the dentist and the doctor, however, without being disturbed about her own responsibility. Taking Jonnie to a psychiatrist was a different matter.

There has been some similarity in my feeling regarding committing my soul to the American Humanist Association. For many years I have wanted to belong. But I feel uncertain as to the significance of membership. I have liked to think of myself as a Humanist, because I believe that all human understanding and vision come from human minds and emotions. But I am unable to accept any dominance of science in my personal religion.

I acknowledge the importance of keeping my mind open to the influences of science. I am conscious of owing great debts to science. I appreciate the vast achievements of research. But I am not a scientist; nor is science my first love. Although I have sought help from psychiatry and other fields of science, there are ways in which poetry, music, the beauty of sky, trees, and birds, fellowship with family and friends, and even attendance at church services with my husband help me far more than any science. These experiences and membership in some organizations have been my chief sources of faith in people. They have helped me to develop ideas and convictions and given me inspiration.

Humanism, as explained by some of its science-minded leaders, is satisfactory and stimulating to Humanists who are scientists and to Humanists who have supreme faith in science. But it seems to me that, while Scientific Humanism is a very important part of Humanism, World Humanism should develop as a more comprehensive philosophy and religion. Scientific Humanism is a free philosophy or religion for those Humanists who feel a primary loyalty to it. But for some other persons, it may seem to be an authoritative religion, almost a dogma, because reliance upon scientific method, upon research, is outside their immediate experience. While they accept the authority of science in some phases of their living, they may be unwilling to make Scientific Humanism a part of their religions or philosophies. They may feel that a personal Humanist faith must be based upon personal experience, intelligence, and judgment.

The musician, the artist, the ordinary citizen cannot use—nor are they likely to desire to use—extensive research or detailed scientific method for finding or expressing truth. If one has faith in people, believes that human values are developed by human beings, and is open-minded regarding scientific findings, Humanism welcomes him as a member. But if Humanism insists that he accept scientific method as *the* method of Humanism and does not value, at least tentatively, what he may contribute by some other method, he is only a second-class member. And he may be conscious of feeling not free. I feel that Humanism should recognize and appreciate many sources of truth and inspiration. Also I believe that the effort of the individual Humanist to gain understanding should be considered *a method* of Humanism, that convictions of the individual Humanist should be recognized as of at least tentative value, and that Humanism should venture sufficient faith in the individual Humanist to acknowledge his need to search for understanding in his own way.

Articles in the *Humanist* have helped me much through many years. But the Ethical Religion has helped me more—for two reasons in particular. One reason is that it welcomes the creative contribution of the individual member even though he be a very ordinary person. The other reason is that Ethical Religion freely acknowledges many sources of truth and inspiration. Although I have long been a member of the Philadelphia Ethical Society, it has never been possible for me to be active or to attend more than a few meetings. Yet this religion has helped me to develop a positive attitude toward my environment and my opportunities. It has helped me to find common ground with many other persons and to combat feelings of inferiority and superiority. It has helped me to feel that I could make some contribution to human understanding and well-being.

The American Humanist Association and the American Ethical Union are good for each other, it seems to me. The influence of each is evident in the Amsterdam statement, but perhaps the Scientific Humanists had preponderant influence. I have been interested to note, however, that some of the leaders of the American Humanist Association are not emphasizing commitment to scientific method, but simply faith in the potentialities of human nature and faith in human experience. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights is a comprehensive illustration of such faith. It is the result of the aspirations and efforts of countless persons, groups, and peoples through many ages, using many different methods. Humanism should be as broad and inclusive as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The Scientific Humanists, as a part of Humanism, have the special responsibility of influencing the rest of us in respect to specific matters. Scientific Humanism may rightly distrust intuition. But I do not believe that Humanism, as a broad philosophy, should arbitrarily condemn spontaneous aspiration and conviction.

Humanism, as represented by a few American Humanist Association leaders, actually does acknowledge and generously encourage the contributions of persons who are not scientists and whose primary loyalty is not to scientific method. But I feel that Humanism should make this acknowledgment explicit. At the risk of being presumptuous, I should like to suggest that the Amsterdam statement should have an additional sixth point. I should like to make a specific suggestion as to what it might contain, awkward though my suggestion may be. Here it is:

> While Humanism necessarily insists upon constant use of the searchlight of scientific inquiry, it recognizes and appreciates many sources of truth and inspiration. Every Humanist, whether especially gifted and trained, or educated by common human experience, can contribute to the development of Humanist understanding by democratic, ethical methods suited to his personality and circumstances.

I should be interested to know how others feel about this matter.

The Ebb Tide of Liberty*

WILLIAM P. JENKINS

Our modern concept of liberty stems from the thinking and the deeds of the eighteenth century, the Age of Enlightenment. In this period great thinkers like Locke, Rousseau, Voltaire, and Jefferson were fashioning a new political era. The words "liberty, equality, brotherhood" were almost magic words. In France, "liberté, egalité, and fraternité" were rapidly becoming the watchword of the age, and we in the Anglo-Saxon countries adopted that slogan: "liberty, equality, brotherhood." This was the slogan which accompanied the lives, the growth, the democracy of modern times. That democratic tide flooded out of Western Europe and Britain and from North America until it washed the shores of the far eastern isles, washed the shores of the gold coast of Africa, until it reached the farthest part of our earth. It is a tide that swelled so large and so fast that many believed there was no possibility that it would ever ebb, that it would transform the world to such an extent that slavery and war would soon disappear from the earth, and only peace and joy would be known.

The tide is ebbing—the tide is ebbing as we have seen it ebbing in two World Wars and in the events that have occurred since. The tide of liberty is ebbing. We move toward a brotherhood perhaps, but a brotherhood of slaves; we move perhaps toward equality, but the equality of death; and if we move in the direction of liberty, we move in the direction of the liberty of obedience or the liberty of silence. The present state of liberty is deplorable when we take the time to examine it. I often think of the irony of the words of Woodrow Wilson when he rallied the American people in the first World War with the phrase: "To make the world safe for democracy." Because of that war, democracy and liberty retreated. It was because of that war in part—and I would say so great a part—that new ideologies came which pushed the front of democracy farther and farther west in Europe until it only remained in what we have come to call "Western Europe." The depression that followed that war pushed the tide of liberty farther back. And the second World War has seen the tide of totalitarianism sweep to the shores of the Atlantic—so liberty has shrunk in that regard.

Liberty has shrunk not only outside our land, not only outside the land of the democratic peoples, but inside as well. A few weeks ago in one of my book talks I was reviewing *The Fear of Freedom* by Francis Biddle, one of the attorney generals of the United States, and a friend of Roosevelt. Here is a book of documentation as to the restrictions of liberty in the United States. He tells us how liberty has ebbed, how the oppression of public opinion, and the oppression of special interests have moved in to strike fear into the hearts of the American people, so that now they are afraid to open their mouths. Fear,—fear of dangers without, and fear of dangers within have come near to destroying the essence of liberty in a land that speaks of itself as the land of the free and the brave.

And it is happening here as well. The things that were said freely five or six years ago are not said at all today. Speakers are banned on the radio, and I notice even though we fought and in a sense won a victory on behalf of freedom of the air on the CBC a year ago, those speakers that were taken off—Bertrand Russell, Frederick Hoyle, Brock Chisholm—have not been heard on Canadian radio since that event happened. The CBC, it seems to me, while it won a partial victory, also suffered a silent kind of defeat, and no commercial radio station would have thought of carrying those speakers in the first place. The radio permits to be heard only those voices that it wants to be heard in our land and in other lands of democracy. We read in the press only what the press wants us to read, and we do not see today the variety of expression, the variety of opinion that we saw four or five years ago. It is dangerous today to speak any good word about the Russians, or even to mention them without hastily explaining that you are not a Communist, and offering some note of condemnation. You cannot even mention Peter the Great or Ivan the Terrible without parenthetically saying, "Please note that I am not a Communist and I am not in favor of what is going on in Russia today." It has become necessary to make those parenthetical remarks every time we speak with friends. I am not unmindful of the fact that it was only a few weeks ago that the United States government found it necessary for any Canadians visiting in the United States for more than 29 days to be finger-printed. Well this in itself is a kind of humiliation—at least I have always thought finger printing was a humiliation—and it is only an incident in a large picture that shows the restraint on liberty—the restraint of movement back and forth across a border which we boast has been free and peaceful for a hundred years.

I think another indication of our loss of liberty is indicated on the occasion when those six people were dismissed from the Toronto Symphony. The fact that they were dismissed is not in itself so much an indication of the shrinking of liberty as the fact that very few people spoke out against it. I ask myself, "Where was the voice of labor, where was the voice of the political left (the non-Communist left)?" None of them would speak out in favor of these people, none of them would even speak out against the acts that were committed. When I asked some of the most partisan why they had not done this they said, "Well, the Communists are behind this thing in some way and we do not want to have anything to do with them." It poses for them, it poses for all of us, a very serious question. If we are to allow the interests of the Communists to interfere with our own expression of liberty, then liberty is indeed on the way to being lost. If we cannot speak out against such injustices, such infringements of freedom when they occur, then we have already lost our liberty. The thing that overwhelms me is the thing that I have already hinted at, is what I have called "the great silence." That is what dismays me most about the Symphony situation. That is what dismays me about every situation like this that arises. If something like this happened formerly, there was a public outcry. The voices of those who were interested in freedom and liberty used to speak out and to shout out so that everyone might hear. Today, when these things happen, everyone is silent. Investigations that have been made on the University campus show that not only the professors are afraid to speak out—they

*A sermon delivered December 7, 1952, to the First Unitarian Congregation of Toronto.

have always been a timorous lot—but the students who used to be more free and more courageous also are afraid to speak out. Those students will not even join a political club on many of the campuses on this continent for fear that the mere fact that they are interested in politics will mark them as subversive characters. We have gone to a great extreme, and in that silence we have indicated that we are giving up our liberty. This is the fact that is most dismaying of all, because if those people who have cherished their liberty now remain silent, there is no hope for liberty any longer. The tide of liberty has ebbed, and is still ebbing fast. And if we keep silent very much longer, if we are fearful very much longer, we shall wake up and find ourselves not only part of a great silence but a part of a great totalitarian state.

Well, what is the cause of this ebb in liberty? Why is it that in these nations—the West, which developed this concept of liberty, which developed to its present state the concept of democracy—why is it that in their very own land, in our very own land, the tide of liberty is ebbing? We ask this of those lands outside the democratic circle. It is certainly because of the failure of capitalism to interest and intrigue those people, it is because of the failure of capitalism to give those nations a share—their people a share—in the wealth of the world. That certainly was one of the major causes of the failure of democracy in Germany following the first World War, when the other democratic nations of the world hampered it and hindered it so that it did not have a share in the fruits of capitalism. This is a failure that drove them into totalitarianism. There were other reasons than this, of course, but this certainly is part of the explanation for the use of totalitarianism in Russia, although again it is not all the answer. Our failure lies, in other words, in the fact that in the process of gathering riches unto ourselves, we did not disseminate our beliefs and our ideas and our pattern of democracy beyond the gates of our own walls, beyond the tides of our own shores. For example, if the people of Indonesia are now endangered by the ideology of Communism, it is partly because their Dutch masters were so proud of their democracy at home, and had reached such a state of human equality at home, that they were not willing while they were the masters of Indonesia to grant any of that freedom and that equality, and particularly to grant very much of the wealth that resulted from their enterprise to the people who produced the wealth. That was our failure, that was our responsibility in part for the failure of liberty and democracy outside our own land.

Within our own land, certainly one of the causes of this ebbing of the tide of liberty has been the development of bigness. Last week I heard Max Lerner at Holy Blossom Temple. In his address he was discussing what he called the "Five Bigs": big business, big labor, big distributions, big communications, and big government. He was using this to suggest when these big phenomena, representatives of big in our society, were out of balance, the state was in danger. But it is these big masses, these monopolistic tendencies in our society, that have tended to hinder and hamper the growth of freedom. It is these tendencies toward massiveness in our society that become a major threat to our freedom and to our liberty, and to our democracy.

I think that to this context we ought to add one other big—that of big religion, because all these big things—big business, big labor, big distribution, big communication, big government, big religion—have moved in the direction of the suppression of individualism and individual liberty. The rise of industrialism and mass production and the rise of monopolies have been a large hindrance to the development of liberty. You might add to that the presence of a war atmosphere as another cause of the restriction of liberty. It has never been known in wartime that men could speak freely and speak the truth as they saw it, without considerable care and without considerable sense of restriction. And we have lived now in a war atmosphere in spite of our pretensions toward peace since probably the year 1914, and possibly even earlier. Almost my entire lifetime has been lived in warlike atmosphere, and it is hardly possible to maintain the open freedoms that we have maintained in peaceful eras in history when war is an imminent threat or a present actuality. War will always restrict freedom. War will always be an enemy of democracy.

Then I find another factor growing out of all these things, and that is the presence of fear in the public mind. Several writers who have discussed this problem of our loss of freedom have pointed out that we are losing our freedom not because some dictator steps in and takes it away from us, but because of the mass opinion of the public, because of the restrictions and fears and the oppressions that are placed on a person's liberty by man. So it is not only because of a Senator McCarthy, or because of other people of that ilk in the United States, that people are afraid to get up and speak their minds in many places, but it is because the public itself has jumped on those people, because the public itself cheers those who speak out for the restrictions. Public opinion is one of the guilty causes of this restriction and this loss of liberty—which is one of the sad experiences of our time.

I think if we take all of these things together we find another factor in the experience of the loss of liberty: that is the failure to create in our lives a kind of satisfying faith that will be greater and more magnificent than the worship of material good. Those people who founded our democracy, those people who developed the ideals of freedom had a kind of faith not expressed in any of the orthodoxies of their time any more than it can be expressed in the orthodoxies of our time—they had a faith in man himself, they had a belief in the value and the virtue of the individual. We have not only lost the other faiths that used to motivate our world, but we have lost faith in man himself. We listen to the voices that are crying out from the pulpits and from the radio and from the press, and if we read the poets and the writers who are presenting their arguments for our enjoyment and our dismay, we find that they too have lost this faith and are crying out for some kind of authority to guide us, poor weaklings that we are, and which of course will also take away our liberty. We need a faith that can rise above the shallow interests and the material goods of life, not by any means to do away with the material goods of life, but to give us some kind of meaning by which we can use those material goods.

These I think are some of the causes for the ebbing of the tide of liberty. And if all of this is so, then what can we do about it? Questions often asked today are: "Is it possible in an age of mass movements, of mass developments, in an age of mass production, of mass radio and mass press and mass man, is it possible to preserve our liberty? Is it possible to salvage anything at all of this glorious past that we have known, or must

we go down into a kind of dull mediocrity, a kind of mediocre equality, which is the symbol of the mass man? Must we go down to the stage that is described in Orwell's books, in *Animal Farm* and *1984*? Are these things inevitable?"

I think they are not inevitable, yet I believe that they are possible, because something must be done, or what will be the result? What then can we do? I think first of all we need to bring to ourselves the knowledge and understanding that something can be done. We must give ourselves the knowledge and the understanding that monopoly can be controlled, that public opinion can be changed, that fears can be put down and that faiths can be put in their place. That, I think, comes first.

Then we must have courage. As Laski has pointed out: "Courage is an essential to liberty." And unless we have the courage to speak and to act in time of crisis then there is no hope. We must know that something can be done, we must have the courage to do it. And with that courage we must have vigilance.

I was amazed a year ago when the attack developed on the CBC because they had broadcast speeches of Brock Chisholm, Frederick Hoyle and Bertrand Russell. The executive of the Civil Liberties Association was not consciously aware that this was going on until the Social Action Committee of this congregation called it to their attention. Yet, this is the very organization developed to watch for these things. Well, that is an example of the lack of vigilance that runs through the fabric of our society. We are not watching for these transgressions on our liberty, and we must watch for them, we must know every one that takes place and then have the courage to do something about them. Without courage and without vigilance, liberty is surely to be lost. So we need to observe with care the things that are happening in our society. Sometimes I wonder if it is not so much the fact that we fail to note these things as a deliberate attempt not to notice them, because to notice these transgressions on liberty is to force our consciences into action, and we are afraid to act. How many of us hastily turn the page when we see an affront to freedom in order that our conscience will not begin to prick us: "You ought to be saying something, you ought to be doing something about this." That leads me to the next thing that must be done if we are to have liberty and democracy, and that is we must break the great silence. We must have done with the quiet and silence that is overwhelming us and destroying our liberty. We must speak out, we must speak out in every instance we find, we must speak out as loudly as we can.

Then finally we must work for the transformation of our society, and that means we must work to give society that kind of faith that gives the individual significance and dignity. We must work to right the injustices and the inadequacies that confront us. This is a long and consuming task, but it must be done. So we can do something about revivifying our liberty only if we revitalize that faith in human dignity and human power which first gave rise to democracy. We must relate that faith to a new social order, the era of Industrial Man. We must transform our civilization from an acquisitive, wealth-obsessed society to a co-operative society where the elevation of the individual life experience is the true goal of all.

Speaking of Man—and Nature

VICTOR S. YARROS

Prof. J. B. S. Haldane must have surprised many pessimists, as well as doubting Thomases, by his recent declaration of faith in Nature and in Man. New books on cosmology and humanity have not erred on the side of optimism. And certainly we human beings have not been giving a good account of ourselves. Yet a case for rational meliorism can be made out. The most remarkable characteristic of man, according to the anthropologists, is his amazing plasticity, flexibility, and adaptability. In the words of Freud, if psychoanalysis has shown that he is worse than we have believed, it has also shown that he is better than we have hoped. His ambivalence is unique in nature. If his ascent has been rather slow, the new cosmogony teaches us that nature's processes are very slow. We have had some seven or eight milleniums of human history, but what is that space of time in comparison with astrophysical and astronomic figures? Our impatience is creditable to our evolved social sentiments, but is it philosophically and scientifically justified? I imagine not.

I have been reading, and enjoying, the late Dr. Abraham Myerson's book, *Speaking of Man.* The author was a Humanist, an atheist, and a veritable dynamo. All his life was devoted to service—healing and comforting the sick, the abnormal, the maladjusted, the frustrated. He studied human beings as they are, not as the metaphysician or superstitious religionist assumes they are. Yet what is his conclusion, formulated a few weeks before his death? This:

> The intelligence of man has created a social structure that presses heavily upon him, inhibiting and sometimes deforming his deep biological drives. To harmonize the pressures exerted by society and by the individual's drive is the greatest single problem of human life.
>
> I believe there will come a time when the divergence between biological adaptation and social adjustment will receive impartial, clear-headed, modern consideration. . . . Little in life is rational; the instincts and biological drives have just enough brain to guide them to their goal, and the necessary social regulations make no sense either. Perhaps we can find some wisdom to guide us, some discipline that does not crucify the powerful longings and instinctive cavortings of men and yet leads to order, decency and kindness. We need a way of life in which the animal, guided by reason, may rump but will not bite. A society in which men can live ethically, wisely and at the same time enjoyably, is the dream of the medical idealist.

Myerson's "perhaps" is scarcely encouraging. The wisdom to guide us has not yet been found. How shall we seek it? Myerson, as a psychiatrist and physician, not unnaturally stressed the divergence between biological adaptation and social adjustment. The problem of man's inhumanity to man, of sadism and cruelty, of savage international conflicts, of war and peace, of collective security despite nationalism, provincialism, and mutual fears and suspicions, Myerson left to the sociologists and ethicists. He was no dogmatic *laissez-faireist.* He believed in the Welfare State, if not in Socialism. He believed in democracy, political and

social.

This brings me to another and more remarkable work: *Ideas and Men,* by Prof. Crane Brinton. There is no concession in the work to cant, piety, and wishful thinking. Is there such a thing as realistic idealism? If so, this is Brinton's philosophy. The paramount question to him is whether a democracy without illusions, "vital lies," is possible. A cynical or hypocritical democracy, he is convinced, is impossible. We have to believe in some fundamental principles. The naive idea of inevitable progress, a sort of natural law of progress, has been rejected. Millenial expectations leave us cold. Brinton is not without rational hope, however. A realistic and half-pessimistic democracy we can live with, according to him.

This attitude was called Meliorism in the days of Lewes, George Eliot, and John Stuart Mill. At bottom, meliorism is a qualified and cautious optimism based on the past. After all, moral progress is a fact. Man has learned to extract good from evil. Two World Wars, plus frantic rearmament and preparations for a third global conflict, infinitely more destructive than anything we have experienced, have dramatized the idea of World Federation and World Government. Scientists are among the most strenuous champions of the revolutionary idea. It is slowly taking root. Even politicians of limited imaginations and little education favor it. We have here a striking illustration of man's astonishing ambivalence. We do not have to "resign from the human race." Man is not yet obsolete. Gadgets and bombs will not save civilization. Humanism may save it. Nay, it must save it!

The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness

ROBERT M. BOWMAN

One dark spring night some eighty-odd years ago, a Maryland country doctor was roused from sleep by the sound of someone vigorously pounding on his door. Rising, he opened the door and found a stranger standing on the steps, breathing heavily and leaning against the doorpost. Behind the nocturnal visitor the light of the lamp revealed the foam-spattered form of a horse ridden half to death. The man gasped out that he had had an accident, his leg was broken. And so the doctor took him in and set the leg. And as he set the leg he set his own destiny. For the doctor was Samuel Mudd, and the man whose injury he treated was John Wilkes Booth. The patient left and Mudd forgot the episode almost as quickly, for such occurrences were common to his life.

But he was not allowed to forget for long. Soon the sound of cavalry hooves and the tread of boots echoed through the countryside—blue coats flashed in the morning sunlight and muskets glittered in the hard noon glare. They came hunting for John Wilkes Booth, hunting for him because in Washington Abraham Lincoln lay dead. The troops came and they found Booth's shoe in the house of Samuel Mudd. When they left, they took the bewildered doctor with them.

In time he was tried for the crimes of murder and conspiracy against the president of the United States. He was not tried alone, but rather as one of a group of persons. As a group they were tried and as a group they were found guilty. To the others went the penalty of hanging, but for Mudd there was the living death of imprisonment on Dry Tortugas. And so an innocent man, a man of mercy, a common everyday citizen like you or me, was caught in the web of hysteria and broken by the spider of Hate.

Samuel Mudd was not the first person to feel the persecution which periodic waves of hysteria and fear have let loose in our land. But neither was he the last. Twenty-one years later, during the confused days when labor was beginning to fight for workers' rights—rights to a decent wage and an eight-hour day—a group of heavily armed Chicago policemen swooped down upon a small crowd in Haymarket Square. The crowd had met to protest the brutality of police, Pinkerton agents, and company thugs in a current strike. The crowd was horribly mauled, but during the confusion a bomb was hurled that killed seven persons, one a police officer. To this day the world does not know who hurled that bomb!

However, those who wished to silence the rising cry for industrial and economic justice—men like the infamous Judge Gary of U. S. Steel—these men saw their fondest hopes realized. Eight men were arrested, agitators all, and charged with responsibility for the murder of the policeman. No matter that most of these men were not even in Haymarket at the fatal moment. No matter that none of them could have hurled the bomb. No matter that they were innocent. It was enough to say that they thought seditious thoughts, such as that a laborer had rights; enough that they rebelled passionately against the evil of the industrial slums that were beginning to blight the brawling young city on the Prairie. And so they were tried, not for what they had done but for what they believed. They were found guilty, all eight, and sentenced by their worst enemy, Judge Gary. Four were to hang and four were to be imprisoned for life. The sentences were given, and the watchword of the hour—coined by the special interests that passed the judgment—was "Law and Order." No matter if your child starved, so long as he died in a law-abiding manner. No matter if your industrial cripple must be a beggar in the streets, so long as he begged in an orderly way. Yes, "Law and Order."

Again, just a little more than two decades ago the flow of American life was disturbed by the Sacco-Vanzetti case. Most of you will remember this case, so I need not outline it here. Suffice it to say that again mass hysteria and a coldly calculated plot united to ring the bell of doom. This time it rang in the ears of an obscure shoemaker and an unknown peddler.

What does it all mean? What do these cases and the dozens of less spectacular ones that mar our nation's ethical history mean?

They mean that, periodically, we as a people go berserk! They mean that at certain moments when we are confused by national disaster, or economic chaos, or by fears of subversive influences (real or imagined) we fall, as a people, into the hands of the wily dealers in personal power. These power-mongers cry to us: "Come on boys, let's make an example of those dirty so-and-so's! Come on boys, let's give them one more kick when they're down! Let's really fix 'em, boys, in the name of Motherhood, God, and the dear old status quo!"

Yes, it means that periodically we go mad. We become a frightened, harried mob, as vicious in our defense of the status quo as any wild-eyed revolutionary attacking the Bastille.

Yet we believe in progress, do we not? Surely, we say, there has been an improvement in the national mind since the days of Dr. Mudd and of Haymarket, even since the days of Sacco and Vanzetti. But has there been such progress? Join me for a moment in looking at the record.

After years of imprisonment, Samuel Mudd was released. To be sure his health was ruined and he died shortly afterwards a broken man, yet he was freed. The mistake was acknowledged!

As for the Haymarket victims, four were hanged and one was murdered in jail (it was reported as a suicide but it is doubtful if a man takes his own life by placing a bomb in his mouth). The remaining three were imprisoned. But in 1892, a courageous governor of Illinois, John Peter Altgeld, reviewed the evidence and pardoned the three on the grounds that they and their dead comrades had been entirely innocent. The trial, he said, had been a travesty on justice, Judge Gary had conducted himself with the viciousness of a rabble-rouser rather than the judicial mien of the bench.

Did men cheer this act of decency? One Chicago minister, the minister of Third Unitarian Church, stood by the governor. Most of the rest damned him as a foreign-born traitor and an enemy of their great idolatry, "Law and Order." The electorate crucified Altgeld at the next election, ruined him financially as well as politically, and threw him on the ash-heap. Threw him on the ash-heap of unrecognized heroes.

As for Sacco and Vanzetti, there were public protests, but no man of the stature of Altgeld rose in their behalf, and so they died.

Has there been progress, then? Has there been evolution? If there has been, it would seem to have been progress down, rather than up, the hill. If there has been evolution it has been in reverse gear. With each recurring wave of hysteria, we are less willing to admit a mistake, less willing that anyone among us should even suggest that we could have made a mistake. The logical outcome of this downward spiral, should it continue through the years, is death to the spirit of truth and justice.

This is the fact which makes the hour in which we live an hour of terror and darkness, rather than an hour of hope and light. The children of darkness are trying valiantly, by every device—however cheap, however dishonest—to destroy once and for all their age-old enemy, the children of light. They go forth in our midst with banners waving as of old. Banners inscribed with the motto: "If you don't like it here go back where you came from." "Strike a blow for religion against atheism." "Don't let them change anything." "Beware of the Intellectuals, just use good old horse sense like me." Yes, indeed, and, like the horse, be shot when you go lame.

It is sad to think that these banners and their mottoes are heeded, but they are. This is why Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas said recently: "The pulse beat of freedom is feebler now than at any other time in the history of the United States." The pulse beat is daily weakening, but who cares?

Yes, we are beginning to face another wave of terror, another reign of hysteria. It is a state of things created by a genuine fear of Soviet Imperialism, but the result of that fear is that we are preparing to sacrifice all we hold dear—freedom, truth, justice, decency, and honor—sacrifice all of them in the name of security. We have all too quickly forgotten the lesson of history, if we ever knew it. We have forgotten that medieval serfdom arose when free tribesmen surrendered their freedom to a strong-appearing man with a castle. They traded their traditional right to elect their own chieftan for the dubious promise that the castle-owner would protect them. And so they became slaves with iron collars riveted about their necks.

Will this be our fate, too? Perhaps! Maybe it will not come to that this time, but if something is not done to stem the tide of today's downward spiral, the next wave—next year or five years hence—may swallow us all up.

What does this have to do with religion? You may well ask this question. I can hear voices murmuring: "These are political and social matters; the church's business is to cheer people up and speak of salvation." Yes, I can hear these voices throughout the land, and many a minister and layman has heeded them.

Yet I answer to this that the church must bear witness to truth and justice before all else. If the church does not bear witness to these, it is no longer the church. It has become instead an insipid spice, an opiate, a social adornment, a parasite on the body of society.

I answer that the struggle in our time between light and darkness concerns religion because the effects of that struggle produce basic formative values for the future life of man. Whatever concerns the life of man concerns religion. Whether he has food, clothing, and shelter; whether he can live without fear of sudden persecution; whether he has an adequate philosophy for living to his highest potential—these things concern religion. That which would endeavor to impoverish him, that which would seek to inspire him with fear, that which would attempt to prevent him from thinking clearly and honestly—these things are fit only to be trampled under foot. If this be so, the church has a witness now. A witness against the demagogues, the McCarthys and the McCarrans—a witness today.

What does the current state of hysteria have to do with religion? I answer that Schweitzer's dictum: "I am life that wills to live in the midst of life that wills to live"—this dictum expresses the prime religious value of all the ages. To recognize the interrelatedness of all life, to reverence it, to endeavor to raise it to its highest power, to strengthen and sustain it so that each man may more nearly fulfill his God-given destiny within the structure of living—to do this is good. That which would seduce us from this high purpose, that which would offer us some lesser value to light our footsteps; that, then, is evil. If this be true, then the church has a witness now. The church has a witness against the cries of expediency. The church demands that the doctrine of "clear and present danger" not be used as a careless club to strike down the innocent. The church has a witness today!

What does the current pall of fear that enshrouds the American mind have to do with religion? I answer that pride and humility are states of mind which have always concerned religion. Pride and humility are inexorably bound up with the problem of today's brain fever. Too often in the past the church has spoken of the evil of pride and the virtue of the humble and contrite heart, only as it sought to protect its own power or that of a protector nation. All too seldom has it

spoken of pride and humility in their dynamic roles as formers of the lives men live together. It is in this latter form that we would think of them today. Their roles in our lives are very real.

Pride is a warper of perspective, a dimmer of the light of truth by the false glitter of one's sense of self-importance. Humility is the sharpener of perspective, the restorer of persons and events to their correct proportions in relation to one another. Pride is to see one side, and that falsely. Humility is to see both sides, and them honestly.

Pride has caused us of the Western World to think very well of ourselves and very poorly of Orientals. We often speak contemptuously or bitterly of the so-called Oriental Mind. It is our boast that the Western, Judeo-Christian culture places great value on the welfare of the individual, while the Oriental culture looks with unconcern upon the plight of the individual. To prove this we often tell the way an old Chinese Emperor punished horse thieves. The method was very simple —go out into the highways and byways and arrest ten suspicious characters, bring them in, behead them all! When the Emperor was asked why all ten men were beheaded when only one was the culprit, he replied that it was too much trouble to discover all the facts and this way he not only got his man, but saved the others from the fate of ever becoming horse thieves.

Primitive, is it not, barbaric and uncivilized? A long way from the high plane of Thomas Jefferson and the Bill of Rights? But let us not be proud, let us be humble, for in this hour of hysteria we, too, are far from Jefferson and the Bill of Rights.

Just the other day, in Chicago, a native-born American citizen said to me: "I'd rather see some *innocent* people persecuted than take the chance that *one* of them might be a spy sabotaging our boys in Korea."

This statement was not made 2,000 years ago by a Chinese Emperor; it was made here and now, in the Year of Our Lord, 1952. And the speaker is not alone in that sentiment. Yet, is it any less primitive, any less barbaric and brutal because it was said by an American citizen? If we will strip ourselves of false pride, we will admit that it is not only primitive, barbaric and brutal, it is tragic! It is tragic because it is a sign of how low some of our people have fallen under the continued braying of the demagogues. It is tragic because it reveals how deeply the malignant hysteria of our times has penetrated into the national mind. It is tragic because it proves that pride, not humility, rules the hearts and minds of men.

And so the church must make its witness now, must make its witness against blind pride.

I do not say these things lightly—these are not matters for lightness. I say them after spending many a sleepless night, many a night until three or four in the morning, thinking about the trends toward hysteria in our national life.

I read of loyalty oaths for housing project tenants, and I wonder. I read the putrid diatribes of men like John T. Flynn, attacking Progressive Education and the National Council of Churches, and I become consumed with rage and with sorrow. I read of Owen Lattimore on trial, and I wonder—will he be a latter-day Dr. Mudd? I remember that Julius and Ethel Rosenberg have been sentenced to be electrocuted after having a trial full of highly dubious factors. I remember this and I wonder—will this be another Haymarket, another sacrifice to appease the crowd that cries for blood to flow in the arena?

But most of all I listen in vain for the voices of men of integrity raised in protest. I wait in vain, and I am sick at heart. I ask myself: Has the cycle at last run its course? Have we reached the bottom of the spiral? Are we so morally impotent that we cannot produce an Altgeld, or an Emil Zola, in our generation?

As I think these things, I upbraid myself as much as anyone else. For I, like all the rest, have not raised hand or voice to bear witness to my faith. I, like all the rest, have been impotent. I, like all the rest, have betrayed a sacred trust through silence. Yes, in some subtle way I, too, have been infected by the national disease of our times. This I confess to you and ask the forgiveness of mankind.

Perhaps it would be well for us all to make this confession in the secret places of our own hearts. If we could do this today, if we could here and now break the chains which the children of darkness have been forging upon our limbs, if we could vow to go forward as children of light, vow to bear witness against the disease of hysteria and fear in our day—if we could do this, something might happen; there might be hope.

The old Zoroastrian religion of Persia has among its legends the belief that, during his lifetime, each man is deciding whether he will enlist in the army of Ahura Mazda, the God of Light, or Ahriman, the God of Darkness. For generations the process of recruitment has continued, but one day the two armies will meet on a great plain. They will fight and the victors will rule the world. The children of light and the children of darkness will fight, and the outcome will be determined by the number and quality of the recruits on either side. The legend is primitive, and yet it has significance, because the outcome of so important an event does not rest in the hands of the two Gods, but with the men who have epoused their causes. So it is for us.

The rush of events has led us to the place where we must be either children of light or children of darkness. Here there is no in-between. The impartial fence-straddler is as much a myth as Ahura Mazda, himself.

If we choose to be children of light, we must be prepared to face the foe and bear witness against him. As religious men and women, we must cry out for truth and justice in whatever way each of us best can.

In the name of human decency, justice and freedom, we must vow that there shall be no more Dr. Mudds, no more Haymarket Martyrs, no more Saccos, no more Vanzettis.

Plain Words

What we need in this country . . . is a greater realization that the interests which all of us have in common are far greater than the points of difference between us. This is true for Democrats, Republicans, and Independents, for the native-born and the foreign stock, for the Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, for Northerners, Southerners, and Westerners, and for the black and white as well. All of us are inheritors of our American traditions. We cannot ignore conflicts or interests. But I ask that we meet them with understanding, not with hate.

—U. S. Senator Paul Douglas.

The Study Table

Book Notes

LOGIC FOR LIVING. *Dialogues from the classroom of Henry Horace Williams. Edited by Jane Ross Hammer. New York: Philosophical Library. 281 pp. $3.75.*

This book is a tribute to Professor Williams, who taught philosophy for many years at the University of North Carolina, by two of his former students—father and daughter. It comprises classroom notes of his discussions for 1921-1922. The major concern and contribution of Professor Williams was, they feel, to teach students how to think, rather than what to think. Hence the title.

The logic of Professor Williams is presented as idealistic, non-symbolic, and focused definitely upon the problems of modern life. The topics covered are: What Thinking Is (logic); What Man Thinks About (nature, history, and God); How Man Thinks; Quality, Quantity, and Relation; and The Achievements of Thinking, which include law, religion, standards, and truth.

Professor Williams undoubtedly made a considerable impression upon many of his students. He goaded and stimulated his students into achieving an individualism. The discussions contain a salty, down-to-earth quality which are of value mainly because they helped to sharpen issues and clear away misconceptions of rather immature students. One is not impressed with either their comprehensiveness or their profundity.

* * *

NIETZSCHE AND CHRISTIAN ETHICS. *By R. Motson Thompson. New York: Philosophical Library. 104 pp. $2.75.*

Mr. Thompson has done a reasonably good job of summarizing for us, in one small volume, the major issues between Nietzsche and Christianity and the limitations of Nietzsche's position. The author has gone to his sources, and brought out the gist of them briefly and effectively. We are grateful, too, for the last chapters of Nietzscheism today, and its relationship to Humanism. Psychological factors are properly recognized. The result is a brief, useful but by no means profound compendium on the subject.

SYLVANUS M. DUVALL.

Unitarian Literary Figure

ELIZABETH GASKELL. HER LIFE AND WORK. *By A. B. Hopkins. London, W. I. (25 Gilbert Street): John Lehmann, Ltd. 383 pp. 21s. net.*

Miss Hopkins has engaged in enormous research in bringing to light the life and work of Elizabeth Gaskell, a nineteenth century literary artist of England who is all too little known today. Elizabeth Gaskell was brought up in an English Unitarian environing situation, where "piety did not exclude fun, but where the importance of cultivating the mind was early and thoroughly cultivated." Reared by her father and an affectionate and capable aunt, and educated at Avonbank, Elizabeth had a good and wholesome start in life. Her early years at Knutsford made a permanent impression on her. Wisdom rather than great learning was the mark of her maturity. Married to a learned Unitarian minister and teacher, she lived a large part of her life in Manchester. The Reverend Mr. Gaskell was not merely the husband of a distinguished novelist, but was a distinguished person in his own right. Persons who are interested in life among the dissenters in mid-nineteenth century England will find this volume profitable reading. And there is a good index.

CURTIS W. REESE.

Appraisal Question

MID-CENTURY APPRAISAL OF CIVILIZATION. *By W. D. P. Warren. New York: Philosophical Library. 80 pp. $3.75.*

In this book a Presbyterian elder and engineer charts the decline of religious faith, family life, community morality, economic security, and Western civilization. To overcome this downward trend, Warren argues for more Christianity, in spite of the fact that if his graphs are to be believed it has been a dismal failure. However, one wonders whether the trends in faith, love, and morality can be determined by charting divorce court statistics, relative expenditures for churches, liquor, and gambling, and their relationship to the national income. Also, one might question whether an improvement in civilization can be achieved by the dominance of Christianity over other ethical religions.

RANDALL S. HILTON.

THE FIELD

(*Continued from page* 18)

Malin reaffirmed the ACLU's position on political beliefs and association with respect to employment in radio-TV which holds that government security agencies are the only proper authority for designating sensitive positions from which persons may be barred and that "in all other positions in a free society employment should be decided on the basis of qualifications strictly relevant to the particular task involved.

"We realize that some performers whose Communist opinions and associations we deplore will, if continued in employment on the basis of the 'single standard of competent performance' thus be enabled to give funds and prestige to causes which we oppose. But that is a risk which a free society must face, and which our free society is triumphantly meeting, without any need of suppression."

The ACLU pointed out that it had no connection with any of the witnesses testifying before the House Committee, and that it was opposed to Communist dictatorship and all totalitarianism "because such movements are the implacable foe of the democratic liberties whose defense is our sole reason for existence." The ACLU also noted that the procedures of the House Committee, in treatment of witnesses, "have improved greatly over those of past Un-American Activities Committees."

ACLU Bulletin.

Western Unitarian Conference

700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois
RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary

101st ANNUAL MEETING, MAY 1-3, 1953

Two daring challenges rang in the ears of the delegates to the Western Unitarian Conference as they left Indianapolis for home on May 3. Dr. Maurice Visscher of Minneapolis, Minnesota, dared organized Unitarianism to take the lead in the fight for intellectual freedom. He addressed the Conference banquet Saturday night.

Dr. Frederick May Eliot, President of the American Unitarian Association, called for the closing of the ranks of liberals to extend religious freedom in his Anniversary Sermon Sunday, May 3. The Board of the Conference voted to give these addresses wide circulation.

"The Need for a Modern Philosophy of Life" was heard by the women's session on Friday. This talk, given by Dr. Curtis W. Reese, attracted the attendance of a number of laymen to the women's meeting. Mrs. George W. Pieksen of St. Louis spoke at the Friday dinner on "Communicants and Communication." Her alliterations, always alerting attention, drove home the thesis that the commitment of communicants was dependent on the clarity of communication. Carrying out the theme of the Conference, "Unitarian Commitment for Tomorrow," Dr. A. Eustace Haydon of Chicago charmed and enlightened the Friday night audience, speaking on the subject "The Significance of Religious Commitment."

The exciting fifty-year history of All Souls Unitarian Church was presented by Professor Justin H. Merriman at a luncheon meeting on Saturday. He pointed out that the first religious service of Unitarians in Indianapolis was held on Sunday, May 3, 1903. Dr. Eliot's Anniversary Sermon was delivered just fifty years to the day from that date. A panel, consisting of Dr. Wallace W. Robbins of Chicago, Dr. Pauline Galvarro of Evanston, Professor Seichi Konzo of Urbana, and Mrs. Harold Johnson of Rockford, was presented on Saturday afternoon. Mrs. Cameron Williams of Indianapolis was the Moderator.

A greeting from Adlai Stevenson was read to the Conference at the banquet, also tributes to the retiring President, Dr. Curtis W. Reese. Rev. Robert T. Weston, President of the Western Conference Branch of the Unitarian Ministers Association, honored Dr. E. Burdette Backus on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of his ordination.

Rev. E. T. Buehrer, minister of the Third Unitarian Church of Chicago, was elected president of the Conference. He succeeds Dr. Curtis W. Reese who had been president since 1939. A standing ovation was given to Dr. Reese at the conclusion of the tribute to him given by the Conference Secretary. Dr. E. Burdette Backus also gave a tribute to Dr. Reese during the business session on Saturday morning. Dr. Leslie T. Pennington, minister of the First Unitarian Society of Chicago, was elected Vice President, succeeding Dr. Tracy M. Pullman of Detroit. Mr. H. E. Clapham of LaGrange Park, Illinois, was reëlected Treasurer. Rev. Randall S. Hilton was reëlected Secretary. These officers serve for a term of three years. New members of the Board, elected for a term of four years, are Mrs. Edgar G. Braun of Detroit, Michigan; Professor Ralph Fuchs of Bloomington, Indiana; and Rev. Arthur Foote of St. Paul, Minnesota. Rev. Lewis McGee, minister of the Free Religious Fellowship, Chicago, was appointed to the Board to fill a vacancy created by the resignation of Dr. Emery Balduf of Evanston.

BY-LAWS AMENDMENTS

Two amendments to the By-laws were adopted. The first one concerned the Investment Committee. Under the new By-law the Investment Committee shall consist of the treasurer and two members of the Board. (The Board appointed to the Investment Committee Herbert E. Clapham, chairman, Howard B. Hauze, and Randall S. Hilton.) The second amendment adopted clarified the meaning of the section on resolutions, making it possible for anyone to present a resolution thirty days prior to the annual meeting, and for other resolutions to be considered, even when not thus presented, by a three-fourths vote of the delegates present and voting.

RESOLUTIONS

No resolutions were presented thirty days prior to the annual meeting but by unanimous consent nine resolutions were considered and adopted, dealing with the following subjects:

1. An expression of appreciation to Dr. Backus and the All Souls Church for the excellent hospitality provided the Conference.

2. "RESOLVED, That the Western Unitarian Conference seek every opportunity to bring Unitarians into meetings with Universalists, plan for organizational union, and instruct its Board of Directors to work toward common summer assemblies."

3. Being interested in maintaining both the quality and morale of government service, "... RESOLVED, That the delegates here assembled at the Western Unitarian Conference urge upon the leaders of their state and national governments a course which will insure the continued service of qualified officials, both career and appointed, in jobs not concerned with political policy, regardless of their party affiliation."

4. On academic freedom: ". . . RESOLVED, That the Western Unitarian Conference, at its 101st Annual Assembly, accept the challenge of Agnes Meyers in her famous speech before the American Association of School Administrators in Atlantic City and make public protest of these Congressional inquisitions in the form of individual letters to our elected representatives, and that we offer complete cooperation with the American Association of University Professors to help them in their efforts in maintaining academic freedom in colleges and universities, and that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the appropriate officials."

5. Uniform Procedures in Investigations:

"NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the delegates of the Western Unitarian Conference, assembled in their 101st Annual Meeting, May 2, 1953, That we call upon our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States to enact legislation prescribing uniform procedures consistent with due process to govern all investigations

conducted by all committees and sub-committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress, and that these procedures be mandatory rather than discretionary, and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That we commend to all American citizens, and especially to all members of Unitarian Churches, immediate study of and support of the bills drafted by Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon and Senator Estes Kefauver of Tennessee, detailing such uniform procedures consistent with due process to protect the rights of individuals summoned before investigations conducted by the Congress of the United States, and

"BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, That we urge all citizens to demand counterpart legislation to be enacted by the legislatures of the several states of the Union prescribing uniform procedures consistent with due process to be followed in all investigations to be undertaken by legislative committees of the State governments."

6. The Conference voted to support legislation for fair employment practices on city, state, and national levels.

7. A resolution commending the Gary (Indiana) *Post-Tribune* on the deletion of racially discriminatory employment advertising and urging the Conference to take measures to bring about similar policies by other newspapers.

8. The Conference endorsed the 12-point program of the American Association for the United Nations.

9. Right of Legal Appeal: "WHEREAS the new Presidential security order gives absolute power to agency heads in our Federal government over public employment under them and denies the right of appeal to those dismissed,

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That we, the delegates to the Western Unitarian Conference, assembled in Indianapolis on May 2, 1953, petition Congress to enact legislation which will give dismissed employes the right of legal appeal through the courts of our land under the rules of evidence there customary, thus granting to every public employee his historic right to his day in court, including the right to know, face, and cross-examine his accusers."

ST. LOUIS NEXT YEAR

On recommendation of the Board, the Conference voted unanimously that the 1954 Annual Meeting should be held at the First Unitarian Church of St. Louis, Missouri.

MINISTERS INSTITUTE

The Western Conference Branch of the Unitarian Ministers Association held its institute April 29 to May 1. Participating in the program were Dr. E. Burdette Backus on "The Power of Preaching," Dr. Tracy Pullman on "Handling the Trouble Maker." Two panels on Unitarian-Universalist Federal Union were held. Rev. John McPhee, Rev. David Cole, and Rev. Albert Harkins presented the Universalist point of view; Dr. Thaddeus B. Clark, Rev. Kenneth C. Walker, and Dr. Homer Jack were the Unitarian representatives. Rev. Ellsworth Smith, Rev. Edwin T. Buehrer, Rev. Jack Mendelsohn, Jr., and Rev. Charles Phillips composed a panel on "Ministering to the Needs of Individuals." Rev. John Brigham and Rev. Max Gaebler talked on the subject "The Minister Participates in Community and Political Activities." Dr. Leslie T. Pennington conducted the worship service and gave the sermon on "Living the Spiritual Life."

In the business session the ministers expressed disapproval of certain sections of the rules of the Unitarian Ministerial Fellowship Committee and the proposed code of the Unitarian Ministers Association. The new officers elected were Rev. John Brigham, Sioux City, President; Rev. Charles Phillips, Des Moines, Vice President; and Rev. John W. Cyrus, Omaha, Secretary-Treasurer.

Universalist ministers from Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio met with the Unitarian ministers for all meetings except the business session.

UNITED APPEAL RESULTS

The Western Unitarian Conference contributed $3,662.86 more this year than last to the United Unitarian Appeal. Following are the results by sub-regional areas:

Area	Goal	Gave	Percentage
Abraham Lincoln Area	$ 6,500	$ 6,382.92	98.2%
Michigan Area	6,962	6,597.31	94.7%
Colorado	1,668	1,448.27	86.8%
Ohio Valley	7,392	6,012.28	81.4%
Iowa Association	5,125	3,775.23	73.3%
Minnesota Conference	5,165	3,632.71	70.3%
Chicago Area	12,469	4,852.67	38.9%
Unassigned	3,231	1,242.10	38.4%
Special Gifts		1,570.00	
Conference total	$48,512	$35,513.49	73.2%

STEVENSON GREETING

"I regret exceedingly that my absence from the country will prevent my acceptance of your kind invitation to participate in the 101st Annual Meeting of the Western Unitarian Conference to be held at Indianapolis on May 1-3 next. I hope, however, that you will convey to the membership of the Conference my greetings and my earnest wish that your deliberations will be full of both personal and spiritual satisfactions.

"By the time your meeting takes place I shall have travelled far enough on my journey around the world to have acquired an enlarged appreciation of individual freedom as the basic source of social advancement and the ultimate bulwark of the spirit of man. And I am certain that I shall understand more clearly than ever before that this freedom comprehends economic improvement as well as the intellectual latitude to pursue and assert one's own beliefs in all fields of human interest and knowledge.

"There will, I am sure, be a vastly heightened respect on my part for the degree to which we have attained this goal of individual freedom—so defined—here in our own country. There will also, however, be a similarly increased fear of retrogression on our part. Having come so far, it is unthinkable that we should lose any of the progress we have made. That is why I earnestly hope that your meeting will address itself in some considerable degree to the specific issues which throng the path of freedom, such as the guaranty of civil liberties, the assurance of educational freedom, and the practice of real brotherhood between man and man.

"The commitment of our faith to these great concerns is well-known and long-standing. The context of our times, however, demands that it be renewed with even greater devotion and steadfastness of purpose. I am confident your meeting will do just that.

Sincerely,

Adlai E. Stevenson."